

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and in light of the following remarks and discussion.

Claims 1, 8, 9, 12, 19, 20, and 23 are amended, and new dependent claims 24-26 are added. Support for the changes to the claims is self-evident from the originally filed disclosure, including the original claims, and therefore no new matter is added. Claims 1-26 are pending in the application.

Initially, Applicant expresses thanks for the courtesies extended by Examiner Gyorfi to Applicant's representatives during the telephone interview on August 20, 2008.

The following remarks are consistent with the discussion during the interview.

In the Office Action¹, claim 6 is objected to for informalities. In response, the listing of claims submitted herewith reflects the correct status of claim 6. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

In the Office Action, certain references submitted in the originally-filed Information Disclosure Statement have not been considered. However, during the interview, the Examiner agreed to consider any remaining references if Applicant amends the claims to recite "work machine." Applicant notes that the claims have been amended in this manner. In addition, Applicant notes that all of the references should be considered regardless of the claim amendments at least because "[o]nce the minimum requirements of 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98 are met, the examiner has an obligation to consider the information." MPEP § 609. Applicant has met all such

requirements. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner consider all remaining references and issue a copy of the corresponding Form PTO/SB/08 indicating that the references have been considered.

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 10-18, and 21-23 are rejected as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,052,788 to Wesinger ("Wesinger") in view of "An IPv6-to-IPv4 Transport Relay Translator" by Hagino et al. ("Hagino"), and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0268113 to Rothman et al. ("Rothman"). In addition, claims 8, 9, 19, and 20 are rejected as unpatentable over Wesinger, Hagino, and Rothman, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,779,837 to Bade et al. ("Bade"). It is requested that the rejections of the claims be withdrawn, and that the claims be allowed, for at least the following reasons.

During the interview, the Examiner agreed with Applicant that no combination of Wesinger, Hagino, Rothman, and Bade discloses or renders obvious the combination recited by amended independent claim 1, including, for example, "a gateway on-board the first work machine including . . . a firewall application . . ." (emphasis added). As discussed and agreed to during the interview, the cited references do not contemplate the subject matter of the amended claims as whole, including a "work machine." The Examiner therefore agreed to withdraw the outstanding rejections.

In addition, Applicant notes that amended independent claim 1 also recites the claimed features of "determin[ing] . . . whether a message received from the first off-board module includes a parameter identifier . . . specifying operational parameters of a mechanical system on-board the first work machine." While Rothman discloses a

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any

remote console that can monitor the temperature of a processor (see ¶ 4), none of the cited references disclose or render obvious "determin[ing] . . . whether a message received from the first off-board module includes a parameter identifier . . . specifying operational parameters of a mechanical system on-board the first work machine."

Amended independent claims 12 and 23, although of a different scope than claim 1, recite features similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. Thus, independent claims 12 and 23 are allowable over the cited references for at least reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with independent claim 1.

The remaining claims depend from one of independent claims 1, 12, and 23, and are therefore allowable over the cited references due to their dependence, as well as for their own features. For example, new claims 24-26 recite the claimed features that "the mechanical system includes an engine system, a fuel system, or an exhaust system," which is also not disclosed or rendered obvious by the cited references.

It is therefore requested that the rejections be withdrawn, and that pending claims 1-26 be allowed.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge
any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 27, 2008

By: 

Philip J. Hoffmann
Reg. No. 46,340